DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 179 280 PS 010 995

AUTHOR Caylor, Florence B.
TITLE Of What Value to Kodaly is Research?
PUB DATE Apr 79
NOTE 28p.: Paper presented at the meeting of the Organization of American Kodaly Educators (Oakland, CA, April, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Developmental Stages; Early Childhood Education; *Educational Needs; *Educational Research; Methods Research; *Music Education; Research Needs
IDENTIFIERS *Kodaly (Zoltan)

ABSTRACT

This paper indicates the need for continuing research in music education and emphasizes the relevance of developmental and educational research to the Kodaly program of music instruction. While music research based on Piaget's and Skinner's work has been done, interest in measures of musical aptitude has declined. Music educators especially need evaluative devices that measure objectively some of the elusive factors that make for talent, learning, and achievement in music. Other areas in which further research is advised, such as the effects of music programs in early childhood education, are indicated. A list of studies of possible interest to music educators who use the Kodaly system has been included at the end of the paper. (Author/RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

OF WHAT VALUE TO KODALY IS RESEARCH?

by

Florence B. Caylor

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Florence Caylor
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED179280

This paper is concerned with the future of the KODALY METHOD as a factor in the healthy growth and development of boys and girls all over the world. It hopes to show that if the KODALY program is to fulfill its potential in this changing world, it must avail itself of all knowledge gained thru research, knowledge that touches any and every segment of this finely structured program that we call "KODALY."

In this decade of the '70s when children in our nation are continuously threatened by fiscal cut-backs that invariably mean deletion of, or quality loss in music education, we are still justifying the existance of music as a public school subject, still pleading with administrators who know the cost of everything and the value of nothing, and still crying about our losses over the last 40 years. For example, we cannot forget that there was a day in the City of Los Angeles when music instruction flourished in the elementary school and most high schools included music history, music appreciation, music theory and two years of harmony besides all the performance groups such as bands, orchestras, a cappella choirs, choruses, etc. It is difficult to forget that today there are still professional musicians in studio, radio and television whose sole conservatory type training, exclusive of their private instrumental lessons, was gained thru the public schools of Los Angeles. In the '40s and '50s the music cuts were severe thruout

PS 010995

all of Southern California; this was true also of other parts of the nation. In the '60s we gained back little or nothing despite Federal programs, and now, in the '70s, the scape goat for this state is Proposition 13. But for whatever reason, whether it be the fiscal cuts or the general adoption of new programs or new priorities it is a fact that in the public schools the children of this state are still being short-changed and not offered opportunities for full development of their potential musciality. Those shining exceptions where full music programs are offered, or where the KODALY program has been adopted are very few and far between. Even those exploratory programs financed and sponsored by Title II of ESEA have disappeared for lack of funds for continuation. What we have left is the same 'University situation' that saved the opera, now struggling valiantly to present to the present and future teachers of music the fantastic potential for boys and girls in the music program of KODALY. Unfortunately, in the U.S.A., most of the Universities offer only summer session courses devoted to the structure of the program and opportunities for developing skills needed to teach KODALY. For research coming from the U.S.A. to be of more extensive value to the development of KODALY, we desperately need a far greater extension of KODALY programs in U.S.A. colleges and universities.

But, to get back to the basic point, it appears that progressive music educators have a dual task to perform: first, to continue the struggle for recognition of the true values of music education to the children of our nation and secondly, to actively pursue the work of the continuously developing KODALY program in order to find

best ways to help our children grow musically. This paper is of course limited and will touch only the values to KODALY in contemporary research.

Two assumptions are basic to this presentation: one, related to the KODALY method and the other related to research itself. With regard to the KODALY method, it is assumed that the program, though finely structured, is nonetheless flexible and may be adopted by any country and adapted to that country's need and its cultural environment. This means that the 'structure' of the program is built on basic principles that may be translated into any language for any environment. It is these principles that must be examined and re-examined periodically in order to strengthen the structure that leads to what we call musicality. The second assumption upon which this paper is based concerns the nature of research as related to 'needs' in the growth of the KODALY program. It is assumed that research means careful, patient, systematic and diligent inquiry or examination into any field of knowledge, and in this case, knowledge of how best to help boys and girls develop their maximum potential musicality. That is what KODALY is all about! The fact that research in music cannot often be treated like research in pure sciences such as chemistry or physics, does not necessarily mean that there needs to be less validity to the inquiry. The fact that research in music sometimes concerns elusive factors and human elements that are not controllable does not mean that it cannot make a valid contribution to the development of a program dedicated to the changing needs of our children.

Regarding the first assumption, that of the flexibility of KODALY: if there is anyone who thinks that the KODALY program is a fixed, unchangeable method, then that person misunderstands ZOLTAN KODALY! For, not only did he write repeatedly -- more than 50 years ago -- that his was a quest for 'direction' and how best to improve and make more useful, more valuable the music instruction, but KODALY also stressed the basic values of music to general education and the loss to cultural developments where music literacy was limited or did not exist. His and his associates' search for best sequential structure for selected materials to be presented and best ways to present the materials is well documented. His colleagues and his proteges have all contributed to the gradual changes made from those early instructional plans to the structure we know today, and that structure, we must point out, is in a continuously growing stage; were it not, it would be stagnant and shortly die. Please remember that while it was ZOLTAN KODALY who told us that music must begin nine months before the baby is born, it is only comparatively recently that KODALY programs were initiated with two-month-old infants in day-care centers. These programs are today only in the exploratory stages, and so far as this writer knows, they exist only in Hungary. So there is a long road ahead with the ultimate goal ever in mind: to build and give to the world that clearly defined, well-structured music program that is vital to the healthy growth of all children in all areas of their development. This means their emotional, their mental, and their physical growth.

Regarding the second assumption, that of the role of research as systematic and diligent inquiry into ways and means of best helping our children develop to the fullest extent their musical potential: the task is tremendous in both scope and detail. It can, however, be greatly assisted by a cooperative search for knowledge, bringing needed information together in order to make for a viable, growing, developing program of music instruction for all of our children. The International Kodaly Society (IKS) recognized this when it formed its RESEARCH COMMITTEE recently and established its RESEARCH LIBRARY at the HOLY NAMES COLLEGE in Oakland, California, thru the muchly appreciated efforts of IKS Board member, Sister Mary Alice Hein. It is the research committee's hope that this library will someday include not only the papers presented at the various national and international symposia and all the materials developed in various countries using the KODALY method, but will also include all available, related research. The research that the IKS committee will be looking for will be research undertaken to establish facts and basic principles related to all factors of learning in music, all desirable outcomes and/or values in music education and the means of attaining them. The committee will be searching anew, i.e., re-searching our goals and the procedures by which we hope to achieve them. There comes to mind almost immediately the KODALY program in San Jose, California, drafted from the very beginning with specific goals, procedures for achieving those goals and plans for the evaluation of results. Such a study will be invaluable in the Research Library at Oakland,

and this is only one example, in one highly specialized area, where research studies can be helpful.

Generally speaking, research that could be helpful to the continuously developing KODALY program could be stated as based on a very few questions: What makes for musical ability? How can we develop it? How do we 'learn' in music? How do we develop complex skills in music? How can we most effectively teach music? Music scientist, James C. Carlsen, organized it more succinctly as musical ability, music learning, music teaching and musical achievement.[1] But what makes this seemingly simple categorization extraordinarily complex in research is that each of these areas of inquiry is inextricably intertwined with the classical areas of research commonly termed mental, emotional and physical development. And the KODALY program itself is intricately interwoven into those very fabrics of learning we identify as the cognitive domain, the affective domain, and the psychomotor domain. This means that the program falls under such areas of research as those covered by psychology of music, the physics of sound, the physiology of the human body, the psychology of learning and so on. This implies that if research is to make a contribution to KODALY, the researcher must clearly understand not only KODALY but the physiological and psychological factors that are involved in its structured 'learning' program. And the minute we talk about a structured 'learning' program, we are involved with theories of learning and theories of instruction! Again, Carlsen states it effectively in his contribution to the First Ann Arbor National Symposium on

applications of learning theory to the teaching and learning of music: "If we are to develop an effective theory of music instruction we must do so on the basis of data which describe the interactions which take place between the learner and the structure of the event being learned."[2]

Music Education en toto has been severely criticized for its failure to make use of, or even relate to psychological theories and principles of learning, but there have indeed been many studies that have been closely related to the KODALY principles. The pity is that this has not been made known. KODALY needs to be strengtheded by such research that, for example, clearly shows how closely KODALY fits Jerome Bruner's theory of instruction, or Gagne's conditions of learning, etc. The normative theory of Bruner is most especially related to KODALY. It emrloys a prescribed approach to instruction by determining pupil needs; it outlines the instructional experience to include predisposition, structure, sequence and reinforcement based on both these pupil needs and the pupil environment. In L.J. Sledge's dissertation on the application of theories of selected contemporary psychologists, he reports seven general pedagogical concerns for instruction in music education.[3] The KODALY program would very well be strengthened if someone would do a comparative study of KODALY and these concerns.

Of course, every discussion of theories of learning and/or cognitive processes begins with Piaget, that great Swiss genetic psychologist who spent forty years studying the development of intelligence before he effected an intellectual revolution in our

understanding of the growth and functioning of the human mind, a very nebulous subject! KODALY specialists should be familiar with research in music that has been based on the theories of Piaget. In 1968, Marilyn P. Zimmerman reported a series of five experiments designed to test the relevance of Piaget's Concepts of Conservation to musical learning.[4] More recently C.W. Hawn has studied the implications and adaptations of Piaget's Theory of Play for the Preschool Music Curriculum,[5] and R.L. Larsen has studied the levels of conceptual development in melodic permutation concepts based on Piaget.[6] Many more studies could be cited.

And then there is the work of one of the most influential theorists in learning and behaviour of the last twenty five years: I refer to B.F. Skinner. To quote Richard I. Evans, in his study of Skinner, "...aside from anything else he (has done), B.F. Skinner is one of the great contributors not only to psychology but undoubtedly to a crucial understanding of the great challenge to man -- the improvement of his educational system and the development of a positive rather than a negative system of shaping the course of life itself."[7] Skinner is best known for his theories of "operant behavior" and it is these theories that have dominated a large body of research in music learning during the last two decades. In music, most of this research related to Skinner has been in the areas of motivation and affect. In a working draft of his position paper for the aforementioned Ann Arbor Symposium in November, 1978, R. Douglas Greer reports ten years of research in music learning using the operant approach to

motivation and affect.[8] This information is of great value to KODALY educators.

Only a few theorists, theories and implications for KODALY are being mentioned in this paper; to do a comprehensive report on even contemporary theories and their relationship to KODALY would be an extensive study within itself. Nonetheless, it must be pointed out that there exists a tremendous body of so-called 'research' in music education and someplace, sometime, someone, in the not too distant future, must review this material, make order out of the chaos, and present for evaluation those studies deemed worthy of consideration for the KODALY Library shelves titled: STUDIES RELATED TO THE KODALY METHOD. Members of the Research Committee of the International Kodaly Society have set for themselves the task of collecting studies from the various countries that they represent, but this work in the recently formed committee has barely begun and problems of semantics, possible models for exploratory and experimental studies, as well as other factors of standards and procedures will be topics for discussion at the next IKS Symposium in August, 1979 in Sydney, Australia.

The literature on specifics in music education shows prolific search and re-search, but the literature on 'values' and what is meant by values is contrastingly scant and confusing. This is a difficult topic to explore since value systems change not only from country to country but from generation to generation. One recent study by William M. Jones reports U.S.A. values in music education as changing multi-directionally in the period from 1950-1970. In

his list of eighteen value categories Jones developed under four general headings (Social Values, Psychological Values, Aesthetic Values and Futuristic Values), only two value categories increased in emphasis during this period; they were Aesthetic Experience and Creativity. Other categories that he listed as values (such as Democratic Ideals, Therapy, Socializing Forces, Enjoyment, Vocational Goal, etc.) declined in emphasis while some values changed direction of emphasis completely.[9]

It was interesting to note that Jones attributes the more radical value changes he found in two particular years (1957 and 1962) to the launching of Sputnik and to MENC respectively. Jones speculates that these two events appear to have influenced the issue of values in music education. Such research and conclusions, when based only on MEJ articles needs to be questioned and re-explored. The whole question of 'values' as reported in terms of what music educators are writing about seems invalid to this researcher. Where 'values' are concerned, what is desperately needed is a series of longitudinal studies showing 'values' to the development of the child. This researcher is involved in a study of lifelong values in early childhood developmental skills in music but has only touched the 'tip of the iceburg' or 'scratched the surface' as the saying goes.

As stated earlier, research on specifics involved in music education, such as those categorized as musical ability, music learning, music teaching and musical achievement are prolific and run the whole gamut of the subject we know as Psychology of Music.

A large number of these studies are of genuine concern to specialists in KODALY and it is with regret that the time allowed for this particular paper makes it impossible to more than superficially report on the many valuable studies in this category. The father of the subject, Psychology of Music, (as everyone knows) was Carl E. Seashore, whose work early in this century revolutionized our thinking about musical talents, musical abilities and possible predictions of success in music. Although a number of scientists preceded him in their interest and research in music and its possible measurement, his work not only inspired many followers and brought about a large body of exploratory studies and experiments in music, but also concomitantly caused a tremendous controversy in music education.

The shock today is that when one looks back over this vast body of then new information and the number of then new tests and measurements, one does not see a resultant positive advancement in music education that came about because of Seashore's or his followers' extremely innovative contributions. And to speak of the present, it is further shocking to see that recent research in the measurement of musical aptitudes has not enjoyed the greatest popularity. Paul R. Lehman, one of the most distinguished contributors to analysis and understanding of research in Psychology of Music, in his 1968 report on the Predictive Measurement of Musical Success, stated: "The most striking development in the measurement of musical aptitude in recent years, in my judgement, has been the sharp and persistant decline in interest in the topic ... in many quarters, this decline

is now almost complete. This, of course, is in great contrast to the tremendous amount of interest, activity, and controversy generated from about 1919, beginning with the first appearance of Seashore's Measures of Musical Talent."[10] Lehman states that there are at least two basic reasons for this decline in interest: 1) the increasing number of music educators who have questioned the validity of the available aptitude tests, and 2) the continued questioning of the basic assumptions on which aptitude measurement is predicated."[11] The old Seashore-Mursell debate is still alive and we most assuredly cannot yet resolve the question as to whether Seashore's 'specific abilities' function identically in isolation as in musical context when we have such astonishing variance in studies of reliability reported. It was found, for example, in the 1974 study of Marilyn L. Dimond, that "the SMMT is of little value as an instrument for predicting success in collegiate music programs and should not be used as such."[12] This reminds us of what David Goslin of the Russell Sage Foundation said in his skepticism of many tests when he wrote: "Attempting to predict future performance on the basis of test scores is much like trying to guess the ultimate size and shape of an oak tree by measuring a sapling in pitch darkness with a rubber band for a ruler, without taking into account the conditions of the soil, the amount of rainfall, or the woodsman's axe. The amazing thing is that sometimes we get the right answer!"[13] It is important to note at this point that after thirty years of faithfully administering the Seashore battery to every incoming student, a highly respected School of Music, abruptly dropped the program with

the retirement of the sponsor.

Nonetheless, the Seashore measures have had great impact and influence and while we are still debating where aptitude leaves off and achievement begins, it must be observed that frequently the difference between them seems to be one of stated purpose while the observable content seems to be very similar. For researchers in KODALY, this is important.

Almost fifty years after Seashore's measurements were published, Edwin Gordon, at the same University of Iowa reported a longitudinal study investigating his Musical Aptitude Profile to predict success in instrumental music instruction. Lehman states that "the MAP is particularly notable for the thoroughness and care that have characterized its preparation. It is unquestionably an extremely important contribution to the study of musical aptitude."[14] KODALY educators should all be familiar with the MAP battery of tests; they are simple to administer and the reliability quotient is high. Unlike the Bentley tests, they base the beginning age on earlier studies of reliability of group tests; MAP does not begin until grade four or approximately nine years of age. They do, however, go thru grade twelve or approximately age seventeen and are usable at the college level.

While it may be stated generally that testing of many kinds in many areas of education fell into disrepute at about the same time that interest in aptitude testing declined, and it may be noted further that serious questions of validity had arisen (particularly in the '50s and '60s when questions of a socio-economic nature,

language and background influences surfaced), it is also true that quite contrarily, interest at that time increased in music tests of achievement. This could have been the result of much pressure from 'programmed learning' and computer development in education or it could have been the result of the sudden popularity of 'accountability' for an education suffering from financial woes. Music achievement tests were not new; some had been on the market for over thirty years and some were absolutely obsolete and still being used. But one standardized music achievement test battery for school use appeared in 1965 and this one is deserving of KODALY attention: the Richard Colwell Elementary Music Achievement Tests I and II and later the achievement test devised for use in Junior and Senior High Schools.[15] It has been used extensively for the past ten years and has an excellent record of reliability.

Yet, despite these and other fine tests on various education levels, we are still very much in need of evaluative devices that measure objectively some of the elusive factors that make for so-called talent, learning, and achievement in music. The problems, of course, are obvious. Music education is a complex and unique blend of many kinds of skills, many types of knowledge and many different reactions and affective behaviors each of which is very difficult to identify, isolate, and measure. Most musical experience is non-verbal and almost impossible to measure objectively. It is a constant search for quantitative evaluation of a qualitative subject.

Music contributes to the quality of human life and how can that be measured? For one group of music educators, the approach expressed in behavioral terms, with clearly established objectives, is the answer. Here the KODALY method would find itself in a comfortable position except for the fact that the whole is still greater than the sum of its parts and 'understanding' and 'appreciation' cannot always be measured in terms of behavioral objectives. This writer did study the document resume of a very interesting project designed to test the effectiveness of an elementary school curriculum guide that contained behavioral objectives and sequencing compared to a traditional guide. It was stated that more than 3200 5th and 6th grade pupils taught by 56 teachers in the Houston, Texas, Independent School District participated in the program. We refer to a study by James C Smith and William B. Crittenden done in 1972.[16] They state that the results of the performance test showed that pupils using the behavioral objective-structure sequencing guide made almost twice the achievement gains during one academic year than did pupils using the traditional guide. Pupil participation in listening and physical movement were found significantly greater in the experimental model. Studies like these are very valuable to KODALY development and should be checked into thoroughly especially as relates to the validity of the research. Speaking generally, of research specifically based upon the KODALY method, this paper would be amiss if it did not at least mention the contemporary work being done in HUNGARY. The earlier works of Kokas (Hungary), Herbert (Australia), Choksy (U.S.A.) and others that are specifically KODALY

are very well known, but the recent material from Hungary, specifically devoted to KODALY is especially exciting. The pity of it is that this researcher can at this point only report subjects being investigated because as yet some of the material has not been translated into English and other materials are not yet released for review. We await the translation of Cs. Pleh and I. Barkoczi's PSYCHOLOGICAL EFFECTS OF KODALY'S CONCEPTION OF MUSIC, the stated purpose of which was to study the effects of KODALY'S conception of music education on mental abilities, attention, anxiety and other factors of social psychology and the psychology of personality. And, we await permission to report M. Voda-Szekacs's APPROACH TO KINETIC FANTASY and also her study of the TRANSFER EFFECT OF MUSIC EDUCATION as well as permission to review M. Kalmar and M. Benis's study titled: THE EFFECTS OF MUSICAL DEVELOPMENT ON THE ORGANIZATION OF QUALITY-CONCEPTS OF PRESCHOOL CHILDREN.

In the U.S.A., while there are many many studies exploring aspects of auditory perception and the nature of listening, and many studies related to the cognative factors of learning in music, there are far fewer explorations into the affective or the psychomotor areas. These two neglected but nonetheless important spheres involving developmental skills in music need inquiry and scrutiny for they are closely related to new developments in KODALY. Especially important is the fact that early childhood is clearly recognized as the optimum time for acquiring music skills that involve the psychomotor domain. But, as far as research in music education is concerned, the real step-child is the affective domain. Perhaps we

are fearful of exploring such a complex area of musical development. If that is a fact, then it must be pointed out that psychologists have long recognized the tremendous need for studies of emotional maturation and studies aimed at understanding emotional stability, while music educators have for a long time been speaking of the values of early childhood music on the development of emotional maturation.

Singing in-tune, the development of pitch concepts and tonal capacities have been the subject of a number of recent dissertations, but creativity is sadly neglected. Music reading is a very popular subject for reaserch and very frequently KODALY is the method explored. This writer is extremely anxious to learn at today's conference of new research in American Folk Songs using the pentatonic. Bernard Schade wrote in 1976: "The American Kodaly programs developed slowly and carefully since 1956. The KODALY approach has been handicapped because sufficient indigenous folk music has not readily been available."[17]

It would be wonderful to be able to present even a brief review of all the many dissertations and research studies devoted to these factors of learning in music related to the KODALY method. Since such a review is impossible for the limited time allowed for this session, the writer has instead, chosen to attempt to include a few selected studies in various areas that may be of interest to KODALY educators. The list may be found at the end of this paper, i.e., followign the references. Apologies are appropriate for any important omissions; these may be added by the reader!

At this time, however, the only really important point is to recognize the need for keeping an open mind, for exploring, understanding and constantly evaluating and re-evaluating contemporary studies.

As stated earlier, the KODALY method is not a fixed, rigid method of instruction; it is an adaptable, flexible structure based upon solid principles of learning in music. It may change slightly from time to time as new discoveries are reported in areas of learning in music, but as KODALY put it: it is still a "quest for 'direction' and how best to improve and make more useful, more valuable the music instruction." It need never, and must never follow stubbornly set educational calf-paths.

May I conclude by reading the last verse of a very old anonymous poem?

" For men are prone to go it blind
along the calf-paths of the mind
And work away from sun to sun
to do what other men have done.
They follow in the beaten track
and out, and in, and forth, and back;
And still their devious course pursue,
to keep the track that others do.
But how the wise old wood-gods laugh,
who saw the first primeval calf ....

Ah! Many things this tale might teach
But I am not ordained to preach. " [18]

REFERENCE

1. Carlsen, James C. Problem Solving: The Role of Research, paper presented at the International Society for Music Education XIII World Congress, August, 1978.

2. _____. Auditory Perception: Concerns for Musical Learning, paper presented at the Ann Arbor National Symposium on Applications of Learning Theory to the Teaching and Learning of Music, November, 1978.

3. Sledge, Larry Joe. The Application of Selected Writings by Gagne, Bruner and Ausubel to Music Theory Pedagogy, Dissertation, Florida State University, 1971.

4. Zimmerman, Marilyn P. How Children Conceptually Organize Musical Sounds. Final Report. Office of Education (HEW) Washington, D.C. 1968.

5. Hawn, Charles Michael. Implications and Adaptations of Piaget's Theory of Play for the Preschool Music Curriculum. Dissertation, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1975.

6. Larsen, Ronald Lee. Levels of Conceptual Development in Melodic Permutation Concepts Based on Piaget's Theory. University of Minnesota, 1972.

7. Evans, Richard I. B.F. Skinner: The Man and His Ideas. (New York: E.P. Dutton and Co., 1968).

8. Greer, Douglas R. An Operant Approach to Motivation and Affect: Ten Years of Research in Music Learning. Working Draft of Position Paper for the National Symposium for the Application of Learning Theory to Music Education, Ann Arbor, November, 1978.

9. Jones, William Mervyn. A Study of Values in Music Education, 1950-1970, To Identify Changes and Directions of Change. University of the Pacific, 1973.

10. Lehman, Paul R. The Predictive Measurement of Musical Success. Paper presented at the International Seminar on Experimental Research in Music Education, University of Reading, England, 1968.

11. Ibid, p.3

12. Dimond, Marilyn L. A Comparison of the Seashore Measures of Musical Talents Sub-Test Scores With Academic and Vocational Success. University of Missouri, Columbia, 1974.

13. Goslin, David. Quoted by Hillel Black, They Shall Not Pass. (New York: William Morrow, 1963), p.137.

14. Gordon, Edwin. "Implications for the Use of the Musical Aptitude Profile with College and University Freshman Music Students," Journal of Research in Music Education, XV (1967), p.34

15. Colwell, Richard. Elementary Music Achievement Tests I and II. (Chicago: Follett Publications, 1965).

16. Smith, James C., Jr.; William B. Crittenden. A Performance Test of a Curriculum Guides Using Behavioral Objectives and Structural Sequencing. National Center for Educational Research and Development. (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C., 1972.

17. Schade, Bernard K. An Analysis of the Melodic Characteristics of Pentatonic Music in Selected American Folk Song Collections and Recommendations for Their Use With The Kodaly approach. The Pennsylvania State University, 1976.

18. Annonymous.

STUDIES OF POSSIBLE INTEREST TO KODALY EDUCATORS*

COGNATIVE ASPECTS

1. Feinberg, S. A Creative Problem-Solving Approach to the Development of Perceptive Music Listening in the Secondary School Music Literature Class. Dissertation, Temple University, 1973.

2. Holman, F.L. An Analysis of Research Pertaining to the Intellectual Abilities of Lower Socioeconomic Status Children and Implications for Teaching and Learning Processes Involved in the Development of Musicality. Dissertation, Temple University, 1973

3. Maddox, E.R. The Development and Validitation of an Achievement Test of Cognative Aspects of Elementary String Class Instruction. Dissertation, The Florida State University, 1972.

4. Parker, J.J. Discriminative Listening as a Basis for Problem Solving Among Four Year Olds. Dissertation, The Florida State University, 1972.

AUDITORY PERCEPTION AND RELATED AREAS

1. Bentley, A. Musical Ability in Children and its Measurement. London: George G. Harrap, 1966.

2. Bentley, A. "Technical problems in group measurement of pitch discrimination and an apparent subjective preference for downward tonal movement." Psychology of Music, 1973, 1 (2).

3. Cohen, V.W. Parallel Goals of the Early Childhood Music Programs. Paper presented at a workshop of the Film Arts Early Childhood Conference at Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, 1974.

4. Comella, F.P. An Exploratory Study of Musical Stimuli and Inducement of Auditory Fatigue. Dissertation, The University of Iowa, 1972.

5. Doyle, A. "Listening to distraction: A developmental study of selective attention." Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1973, 15.

*Many of these studies may be classified in more than one category.

6. Duell, O.K. and R.C. Anderson, "Pitch discrimination among primary school children." Journal of Educational Psychology, 1967, 58, Pt.2.

7. Heller, J.J. and C. Campbell. Auditory Perception in Music Teaching and Learning. Paper presented at the Ann Arbor National Symposium on the Application of Learning Theory in the Teaching and Learning of Music, Nov., 1978.

8. Horowitz, A.B. "Habituation and memory: Infant cardiac response to familiar and auditory stimuli." Child Development, 1973, 43.

9. Leonhard, C. and R. House. Foundations and Principles of Music Education, New York: McGraw Hill, 1959.

10. Leonard, C. and R. Colwell. "Research in music education," Bulletin, Council for Research in Music Education, Winter, 1976.

11. Lunden, R.W. An Objective Psychology of Music. New York: Ronald Press, 1967.

12. Maccoby, E.E. and K.W. Konrad, "The effects of preparatory set on selective listening: Developmental trends." Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 1967, 32.

13. MacDonald, D.T. and R.H. Ramsey, "A study of musical auditory information procession of children." Paper read at MENC, Atlantic City, 1976.

14. Madsen, C.K., F.A. Edmonson and C.H. Madsen, Jr. "Modulated frequency discrimination relationship to age and musical training." The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 1969, 46.

15. Petzhold, R.G. Auditory Perception of Musical Sounds by Children in the First Six Grades. University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1966. Report CRP-1051; ED 010 297.

16. Reineke, T.C.R. Dichotic and Monaural Perception of Music and Speech by Musicians and Nonmusicians. Unpublished paper, University of Washington, School of Music, 1978.

17. Rosborough, K. and others. Teaching the Young Child to Sing: A Literature Review with Annotated Bibliography. SWRL Laboratory for Educational Research, Los Alamitos, California, 1972.

18. Soderquist, D.R. and J. Moore, "Effect of training on frequency discrimination in primary school children." Journal of Auditory Research, 1970, 10.

19. Tapley, I.B. An Evaluation of Musical Training in Auditory Perception for First Grade Children. Dissertation, The University of Florida, 1976.

20. Taylor, J.A. "Perception of tonality in short melodies." Journal of Research in Music Education, 1976, 4.

21. Ward, W.D. "Musical perception," in Foundations of Modern Auditory Theory, ed. J.V. Tobias, London: Academic Press, 1970.

22. Williams, D.B. "Children's perception of motion in unidirectional, two- and three- pitch melodic patterns and the related effects of change in timbre, loudness, and duration." SWRL Educational Research and Development, 1977.

23. Williams, D.B. The Nature of Listening and Learning, a paper prepared for the National Committee on Instruction, MENC, Chicago, 1978.

24. Zemke, Sr. L. The Kodaly Method and a Comparison of the Effects of a Kodaly-Adopted Music Instruction Sequence on Auditory Musical Achievement in Fourth Grade Students. Dissertation, USC, 1973.

PITCH CONCEPT FORMATION, SINGING IN TUNE, etc.

1. Hansen, S.B. The Effect of Peer Approval and Disapproval on Pitch-Matching Performance and Group Behavior. Dissertation, Columbia University, 1975.

2. Jerseld, A.T. and S.F. Bienstock, "A study of the development of children's ability to sing." Journal of Educational Psychology, 1934, 25. (Of great interest for comparison.)

3. Long, P.A. "Relationship between pitch memory in short melodies and selected factors." Journal of Research in Music Education, 1977, 4.

4. Miller, P.H. An Experimental Analysis of the Development of Tonal Capacities of First Grade Children. Dissertation, University of Iowa, 1972.

5. Moss, W.A. A Study of the Use of Bone Conduction Hearing as an Aid to Improvement of Out-of-Tune Singers. Dissertation, University of Miami, 1973.

6. Oren, G.A. Developing Specialized Programs for Singing in the Elementary School. Office of Education (HEW), Bureau of Research No. BR-5-0241, 1968.

7. Smith, S.R. Factors Related to Children's In-Tune Singing Abilities. Dissertation, West Virginia University, 1973.

8. Zwissler, R.N. An Investigation of Pitch Discrimination Skills of First Grade Children Identified as Accurate Singers and Those Identified as Inaccurate Singers. Dissertation, UCLA, 1971.

MUSIC READING

1. Autry, M.R. A Study of the Effect of Hand Signs in the Development of Sight Singing Skills. Dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin, 1975.

2. GARCIA, R.O. An Evaluation of a Combined Violin-Vocal Approach to Teaching Music Reading When Compared With Essentially Vocal Approach. Dissertation, Washington University, 1971.

3. McDaniel, M.A. A Comparison of Music Achievement Test Scores of Fourth-Grade Students Taught by Two Different Methods - Kodaly (Threshold to Music)and Traditional (Making Music Your Own). Dissertation, Louisiana State University, 1974.

4. Palmer, M.H. The Relative Effectiveness of the Richards and the Gordon Approaches to Rhythm Reading for Fourth Grade Children. Dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana, 1974.

5. Richardson, H.V. An Experimental Study Utilizing Two Procedures for Teaching Music Reading to Children in Second Grade. Dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1971.

6. Skewes, R.E. Determination of the Optimal Time for the Utilization of a Self-Instruction Program in Music Theory by Elementary Violin and Viola Students. Dissertation, University of Iowa, 1974.

7. Stevens, R.E. A Comparative Study of Two Instructional Methods in Music Reading at the Grade V and VI Level. Dissertation, University of Oregon, 1974.

8. Tillotson, J.R. A Study of Learning Characteristics as Identified in the Music Reading Process. Dissertation, Northwestern University, 1972.

DEVELOPING MUSIC LISTENING SKILLS

1. Hoover, P.D. A Synthesis of the Findings of Research Related to the Process of Listening to Music, The Status of the Research and Implications for Music Education. Dissertation, University of Oregon, 1974.

2. Ringer, A.L. An Experimental Program in the Development of Musical Literacy Among Musically Gifted Children in the Upper Elementary Grades With Emphasis on the Potential Impact of Kodaly-Inspired Musical Education. Office of Education, (HEW), Washington, D.C., Bureau of Research, 1970.

3. Smith, H.H. A Comparative Study of an Aural Identification System with a Typical Method to Develop Music Listening Skills. Dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1972.

4. Williams, D.B. "Children's identification of melodic pitch motion: Effects of initial proficiency interval size, direction and durational variation." SWRL Educational Research and Development, 1974.

5. Williams, D.B. A Study of Tonal Strength and its Influence on Melodic Memory. (Unpublished paper). Illinois State University, 1978.

CREATIVITY

1. Flemming, B.M. and others. Resources for Creative Teaching in Early Childhood Education. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc. 1977.

2. Harvey, A.W. Abraham Maslow: Implications for the Development of Creative Music Education. Dissertation, Temple University, 1974.

3. Martinson, R.A. The Abilities of Young Children. Council for Exceptional Children, Washington, D.C., 1967.

4. Vaughan, M.M. Music as a Model and Metaphor in the Cultivation and Measurement of Creative Behavior in Children. Dissertation, University of Georgia, 1971.

MUSIC TESTS AND MEASUREMENTS

1. Bailey, J.R. The Relationships Between the Colwell Music Achievement Tests I and II, The SRA Achievement Series, Intelligence Quotient, and Success in Instrumental Music in the Sixth Grade of the Public Schools of Prince William County, Virginia. Dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana, 1975.

2. Bullock, W.J. Construction and Evaluation of a Test of Musico-Aesthetic Attitude. Dissertation, The Florida State University, 1971.

3. Dvorak, W.D. An Investigation of the Colwell Music Achievement Tests as an Instrument for Diagnostic Evaluation for Undergraduate Music Education Students. Dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana, 1975.

UNCLASSIFIED STUDIES

1. Asselin, M.M. Graphic Representation of Musical Concepts: A Computer-Assisted Instructional System. Dissertation, The University of Connecticut, 1972.

2. Franklin, J.L. The Effects of Rock Music on the Reading Comprehension of Eighth-Grade Students. Dissertation, The University of Iowa, 1976. (This one is unbelievable.)

3. Glenn, K.J. The Potential Use of Television for Early Childhood Music Education. Dissertation, The University of Michigan, 1972.

4. Miller, S. Gifted and Talented Program. Study done in the Greater Juneau Borough School District, Alaska, 1974.

5. Nicholson, D.L. Music as an Aid to Learning. Dissertation, New York University, 1972.

6. Taebel, D.R. The Effect of Various Instructional Modes on Children's Performance of Music Concept Tasks. Office of Education (HEW), Washington, D.C., Bureau of Research, 1972.

7. Tanner, F.D. The Effect of Disc Jockey Approval on Music and Peer Approval of Music on Music Selection. Dissertation, Columbia University Teachers College, 1976.

8. Van Asselt, J. Music as an Aid to Teaching German in Elementary Schools. Office of Education (HEW), Washington, D.C., 1970. (Uses Kodaly).

9. Williams, D.B. SWRL Music Program: Ethnic Song Selection and Distribution. Technical Note. SWRL, Los Alamitos, California, 1972.

- - - - - - - - - -

Invited paper presented at the Organization of American Kodaly Educators, Oakland, California, April, 1979.

Florence B. Caylor, Ph.D.